

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Docket No. F-8388

**DEC 19 2006**

Ser. No. 10/509,818

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 11-14 and 20-26 are rejected for being anticipated by Godley (US 4187030). Claims 16-19 and 24 are rejected as being unpatentable over Godley. Claims 7-9 are rejected as being unpatentable over Godley as modified by Martin (US 4362272).

Applicant has further amended claims 1 and 25 to overcome the references.

The claims now recite:

"...the first flight disposed along a plurality of revolutions about said shaft at a first helical pitch..."

That is, figures 1-3 illustrate elements in region B disposed about the shaft along a first helical pitch.

The claims continue to recite:

"...further elements in a further element section, the further element section disposed along at least one revolution about said shaft at a second helical pitch that is smaller than the first helical pitch..."

The same figures illustrate further elements in region A disposed about the shaft along a second pitch that is smaller than the first pitch. Therefore, as disclosed in the specification on page 11, ph. 2, the elements are closer together in region A than in region B.

The claims also recite:

Docket No. F-8388

Ser. No. 10/509,818

“...the number of further elements disposed along said at least one revolution about said shaft in said further element section being greater than the number of elements disposed along each revolution about said shaft in said first flight...”

The same figures illustrate that there are more elements per revolution of the shaft in region A than in region B. For example, in each revolution in region B of the shaft, 4 elements (e.g., elements 41-44) are illustrated in figure 1. On the other hand, in one revolution in region A, 8 elements (e.g., elements 8-15) are illustrated in Figure 3.

The claims further recite:

“...the further element section which axially protrude protruding into the first flight disposed at least in partial regions of the first flight”

The figures illustrate that the axial space occupied by elements in region A overlaps with the axial space occupied by elements in region B.

In comparing the claimed recitations to Godley, for example, the reference discloses two patterns of fins on a hub in figures 2-4, including a configuration having more fins in figures 3 and 4 than in figure 2. However, when the differing fin patterns are placed on a common hub, the *helical pitch* remains constant along the shaft. Martin also fails to teach the combination of elements now provided in the claims. Accordingly, the amended claims are patentable over the teachings of Godley and Martin.

Docket No. F-8388

Ser. No. 10/509,818


The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency  
or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Docket No. F-8388

Ser. No. 10/509,818

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By   
Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340